



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

HL

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,242	12/21/2001	Jeri L. Callaway	COMP:0200B	7878
7590 05/16/2007 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION LEGAL DEPARTMENT, M/S 35 P.O. 272400 FT. COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER [REDACTED]	PITARO, RYAN F
ART UNIT [REDACTED]		PAPER NUMBER 2174		
MAIL DATE 05/16/2007		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/038,242	CALLAWAY ET AL.
	Examiner Ryan F. Pitaro	Art Unit 2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-92 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-33 and 67-92 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 34-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-92 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. This communication is filed in response to Amendment D, filed 2/22/2007.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-33,67-92 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art is silent in managing a person's family related matters and work related matters while prevent the person's business associates from accessing the person's family related matters and while preventing the person's family from accessing the person's work related matters.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claim 34,36-38,40-47,49-55,57-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated over Raff ("Raff", US 6,785,868).

As per claim 34, Raff discloses method for managing a combination of family related matters and work-related matters, the method comprising the acts of: communicating personal information related to a family manager's personal life from at least one first device to a host computer (Column 10 lines 11-52); communicating the work information related to the family manager's work life from at least one second device to the host computer (Column 10 lines 11-52), and Communicating the personal information and the work information from the host computer to a third device dedicated to the family manager (Column 10 lines 11-52, Figure 15).

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff teaches a method, wherein the host computer comprises a public host computer (Raff, Figure 9).

As per claim 37, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff teaches a method wherein the host computer comprises a single host computer (Raff, Figure 9).

As per claim 38, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff teaches a method wherein the host computer comprises at least two host computers (Raff, Column 10 lines 11-26).

As per claim 40, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff teaches a method wherein the devices comprise calendaring capability (Raff, Figure 11B).

As per claim 41, which is dependent on claim 7, Raff teaches a method wherein the first device comprises at least one calendar corresponding to the merger of personal information and work information comprising at least one of a daily merged calendar, a weekly merged calendar, and a monthly merged calendar (Raff, Figure 17).

As per claim 42, which is dependent on claim 7, Raff teaches a method wherein the second device comprises at least one calendar corresponding to the merger of personal information and work information comprising at least one of a daily merged calendar, a weekly merged calendar, and a monthly merged calendar (Raff, Figure 11B item 442).

As per claim 43, which is dependent on claim 7, Raff teaches a method wherein the third device comprises at least one calendar corresponding to the merger of personal information and work information comprising at least one of a daily merged calendar, a weekly merged calendar, and a monthly merged calendar (Raff, Figure 11B item 446).

As per claim 44, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff teaches a method wherein the devices comprise computing capability (Raff, Column 5 line 60 – Column 6 line 10).

As per claim 45, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff teaches a method wherein at least one of the devices comprise a personal digital assistant (Raff, Column 6 lines 25-33).

As per claim 46, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff teaches a method wherein the acts of communicating are performed via an Internet link (Raff, Column 7 lines 17-25).

Claim 47 is individually similar in scope to that of claim 34, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 49 is individually similar in scope to that of claim 36, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 50,52 is individually similar in scope to that of claim 37, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 51,53 is individually similar in scope to that of claim 38, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 54, which is dependent on claim 47, Raff teaches a method wherein the first host computer and the second host computer comprise the same computer (Raff, Figure 9, Column 11 line 64 – Column 12 line 44).

As per claim 55, which is dependent on claim 47, Raff teaches a method, wherein the first host computer and the second host computer comprise different computers (Raff, Column 10 lines 11-26).

Claim 57 is individually similar in scope to that of claim 40, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 58-63 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 41-43, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 64 is individually similar in scope to that of claim 44, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 65 is individually similar in scope to that of claim 45, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 66 is individually similar in scope to that of claim 46, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

4. Claims 35,39,48, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raff ("Raff", US 6,785,868) in view of Edwards et al ("Edwards", US 2002/0078379).

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 34, Raff fails to specifically point out a private host computer. However, Edwards teaches a method, wherein the host computer comprises a private host computer ([0010]-[0012]). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the private computer

of Edwards with the method of Raff. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a secure way of accessing applications, programs, and capabilities of the device.

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 34, Raff-Edwards teaches a method wherein the devices comprise e-mail capability (Edwards, [0010] lines 1-15).

Claim 48 is individually similar in scope to that of claim 35, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 56 is individually similar in scope to that of claim 39, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

The Examiner attempted to contact the Attorney to setup an interview. Given the scheduling conflicts of both the Examiner and the Attorney, no interview has taken place. The Examiner invites the Applicant's representative to call upon receiving this office action to set up an interview if there are any questions regarding the current application.

Applicant argues in respect to claim 34 that Raff fails to teach the claimed limitations. Specifically the Applicants argue that family managers share each other's

personal information, but the work related information for each family manager remains segregated. Unlike other claims pending, nowhere in the claim language does it point out segregation of any information. The way the claim reads now, all information can be sent to all of the devices and the limitations would still be met. With respect to Lui, this reference is no longer applied and the arguments have been considered but are moot.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1-33, 67-92 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F. Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Mondays through Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Art Unit 214
Patent Examiner

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100